

REMARKS

In an Office Communication mailed January 29, 2007, the Examiner argued that Applicant's prior amendment was not fully compliant, as discussed below. Applicant thanks the Examiner for the helpful telephonic conference on February 8, 2007.

Applicant acknowledges the typographical error wherein under "Remarks" only Claims 21 and 22 were mentioned as added. As correctly noted by the Examiner, Applicant had also added new Claims 22-28. Accordingly, Claims 1-28 are presented for examination.

Support for Amended Claims

The Examiner alleged that Applicant did not show support for the amended claims. Applicant respectfully disagrees and points the Examiner to the statement made on page 7 of the their October 31, 2006 response wherein they pointed to page 19, lines 4-11 of the specification for support of amended Claims 1 and 19 which states:

By selecting one of the tabs, the browser component (eg: window) that is linked to the selected tab is moved to the front position on the desktop. This makes the page that is displayed within that browser component appear to the user, while the pages simultaneously displayed within the other browser components are hidden.

This clearly supports Applicant's amendments regarding using a software control such as a tab to select one browser component so that a first page is displayed to a user, while a second page displayed in a second browser component is hidden from a user.

In the telephonic conference on February 8, 2007, the Examiner asked Applicant's representative to explain their support for Claim 10 and stated that because this claim did not mention the term "hidden pages" it differed from the language of independent Claims 1 and 19. While Claim 10 does not explicitly state that pages are "hidden" it does recite a method whereby the first browser component is active and displays a first electronic page and a second browser component is inactive and does not display a second electronic page and wherein activation of a software control results in the second browser component becoming active and displaying the second electronic page. Thus, selecting the software control, such as a tab, results in a page that was not displayed (hidden) becoming a displayed page. Support for this claim can be found at least on page 10, beginning at line 24 and page 19, beginning at line 7 as discussed above. In addition, support for activating different tabs to display different electronic web pages can be

found at least in the description of Figures 17 and 18 at page 26, beginning on line 9. As shown above, this section of the specification supports claims to using a software control to select a browser component, wherein the selection results in a page displayed within the browser component becoming active and appearing to the user while a second page becomes inactive and not displayed (hidden) from the user.

Support for the new claims

In the Response filed on October 31, 2006, Applicant added new Claims 21-28. Support for Claim 21 can be found at least on page 5, lines 18-20. Support for new Claim 22 can be found at least on page 14, lines 16-26. Support for new Claim 23 can be found at least on page 29, lines 36-42.

New independent Claim 24 relates to an internet browser program for displaying electronic web pages, comprising a first browser component configured to display a first electronic web page; a second browser component configured to display a second electronic web page; a first tab control configured to display said first electronic web page and hide said second electronic web page; and a second tab control configured to display said second electronic web page and hide said first electronic web page. Support for a browser program that comprises separate browser components can be found at least on page 5, lines 10-20. Support for the browser components being configured to display electronic web pages can be found at least on page 5, lines 21-26. Support for a tab control is found at least on page 6, lines 5-9, page 19, lines 1-3 and the description of Figure 17 on page 26. Support for multiple tab controls being configured to display one electronic web page and hide a second electronic web page is found at least on page 19, lines 4-11.

Support for Claim 25 can be found at least on page 12, line 14. Support for Claim 26 can be found at least on page 5, lines 18-20. Support for Claim 27 can be found at least at page 19, lines 4-11. Support for Claim 28 can be found at least on page 19, lines 4-11.

Clarification of term "pages"

The Examiner also asked the Applicants to clarify the use of the term "pages" as they were used in the claims. Applicants have amended the claims to refer to an "electronic page" or

a “web page” in order to clarify the claim language for the Examiner. A web page is an electronic page residing on the Internet (page 2, line 8). As discussed throughout the specification, an electronic page is made up, for example, by Hypertext Markup Language (HTML) and corresponds to a document that is parsed and viewed in a browser component.

The pending claims are not anticipated

In the telephone conference with the Examiner, has asked that Applicants explain more fully how Claim 10 and the new Claims 21-28 were distinguishable from the prior art.

The Examiner has rejected Claims 1, 2, 4, 8-11, 13, and 17-19 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,452,609 to Katinsky et al. In regard to Claim 1, the Examiner stated that “Katinsky teaches a system (abstract) for providing a distributed software application (col. 1, line 1 – col. 3, line 5), comprising:

Applicant respectfully submits that Katinsky fails to describe “wherein said first browser component is active and displays said first electronic page, and said second browser component is inactive and does not display said second electronic page, and *wherein activation of the software control results said second browser component becoming active and displaying said second electronic page.*” as recited in Claim 10.

Katinsky describes a system for manipulating media objects including a media access area *Figs 1 and 2, #12*. However, Katinsky does not describe this media access area panel as activating and displaying different electronic pages. Instead, Katinsky teaches accessing a database to reconstruct an outline within the existing panel each time an item is selected.

Katinsky describes a system for displaying and managing media files on a web page including a media access icon panel. *Abstract; Figs. 1, 2A and 2B, #12*. The media access icon panel displays an outline as a bulleted list. *Col. 4, lines 26-36; Figs. 2A and 2B, #24 and #26*. Clicking on the either the text of a bulleted item or a corresponding outline tab causes the next level of the outline to be displayed. *Col. 4, lines 37-41; Fig. 2B, #29*. At the lowest level of this outline are the actual media objects that are manipulated by the user. *Col. 4, lines 50-65, Fig. 2C, #30*. As each level of the outline is displayed, sections of the outline expand and collapse so that only one level of the outline is expanded at one time. *Col. 4, lines 42-45*.

As described by Katinsky, the process of expanding and collapsing the outline is not a matter of activating and hiding pages, but rather reconstructing the portion of the outline to be displayed on the existing page. The information to build the outline is contained in the interface database. *Col. 9, lines 34-39*. When a user clicks on a line or tab in the media access icon panel, a query is sent to the interface database which returns the information to be displayed. *Col. 11, lines 15-25*. When the interface database returns the information, it is stored in a temporary data source object before being copied to the DHTML array of the media access icon panel. *Col. 11, lines 29-38*. This DHTML array is the same array before and after any line or tab is selected. The content of media access icon panel is updated. *Col. 11, lines 41-51*. The panel itself is not replaced by another panel or object.

Thus, Katinsky fails to describe, either expressly or inherently, “wherein said first browser component is active and displays said first electronic page, and said second browser component is inactive and does not display said second electronic page, and wherein activation of the software control results said second browser component becoming active and displaying said second electronic page.” as recited in Claim 10. In contrast to the system of Claim 10, the media access area described by Katinsky represents a single page that is updated to display new information.

Claim 24 recites a first tab control configured to display said first electronic web page and hide said second electronic web page; and a second tab control configured to display said second electronic web page and hide said first electronic web page. Similar to Claim 10, Katinsky does not teach any tabs that are configured to display one page, while hiding a second page.

Therefore, as Katinsky fails to describe, either expressly or inherently, every element recited in Claims 10 or 24.

Conclusion

Applicant has endeavored to address all of the Examiner’s concerns as expressed in the outstanding Action. Accordingly, arguments in support of the patentability of the pending claim set are presented above. In light of these remarks, reconsideration and withdrawal of the outstanding rejections is respectfully requested. Should the Examiner wish to discuss these or

Appl. No. : 09/912,646
Filed : July 24, 2001


any other issues regarding the aforementioned, he is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number provided below.

Please charge any additional fees, including any fees for additional extension of time, or credit overpayment to Deposit Account No. 11-1410.

Respectfully submitted,

KNOBBE, MARTENS, OLSON & BEAR, LLP

Dated: February 26, 2007

By: 
Michael E. Fuller
Registration No. 36,515
Attorney of Record
Customer No. 20,995
(619) 235-8550

3388947
020607